

## Message Text

PAGE 01 NATO 05483 050933Z

20

ACTION EUR-25

INFO OCT-01 ISO-00 CIAE-00 PM-07 INR-11 L-03 ACDA-19

NSAE-00 PA-04 RSC-01 PRS-01 SP-03 USIA-15 TRSE-00

SAJ-01 OIC-04 DRC-01 MC-02 SS-20 NSC-07 H-03 OMB-01

AEC-11 /140 W

----- 013193

R 041705Z OCT 74

FM USMISSION NATO

TO SECSTATE WASHDC 8001

SECDEF WASHDC

INFO USNMR SHAPE

USCINCEUR

USLOSACLANT

CINCLANT

S E C R E T USNATO 5483

E.O. 11652: GDS

TAGS: MPOL, PFOR, NATO, US

SUBJECT: US TRILATERAL DPQ EXAMINATION

INTERNATIONAL STAFF HAS PASSED MISSION COPY OF QUESTIONS (QUOTED BELOW) SHAPE REPS INTEND TO ASK DURING TRILATERAL EXAMINATION OF US FORCE PLANS AS PRESENTED IN DPQ(74). QUESTIONS FOLLOW:  
BEGIN TEXT:

MEMORANDUM - GENERAL

REFERENCE PAGE 1, PARAGRAPH 3, LINE 25

THE AIRBORNE BATTALION COMBAT TEAM STATIONED AT VICENZA IS EARMARKED FOR THE ALLIED COMMAND EUROPE MOBILE FORCE. IN THE EVENT THAT THE ACE MOBILE FORCE IS NOT DEPLOYED CAN IT BE ASSUMED THAT THE ACCB IS EARMARKED FOR SACEUR AS PART OF HIS STRATEGIC RESERVE?

1L06

PROBLEM:

SECRET

PAGE 02 NATO 05483 050933Z

PART (B) OF THIS FORCE GOAL CALLED FOR AN INVESTIGATION OF THE PROVISION OF A BUTTON-ON ANTI-TANK CAPABILITY. THIS SUBJECT IS NOT ADDRESSED IN THE DPQ REPLY.

QUESTION:

ARE INVESTIGATIONS BEING MADE REGARDING THE PROVISION OF A  
BUTTON-ON ANTI-TANK CAPABILITY FOR UTILITY AND OBSERVATION HELICOPTERS?

1L07

PROBLEM:

THIS FORCE GOAL CALLED FOR EW UNITS WITH STATED CAPABILITIES  
TO PROVIDE EW SUPPORT FOR NATO AT SIMPLE ALERT IN ACCORDANCE WITH  
THE NATO ALERT SYSTEM. THIS ASPECT OF THE FORCE GOAL IS NOT  
ADDRESSED IN THE DPQ REPLY.

QUESTION:

IS THE UNITED STATES PREPARED TO MAKE EW UNITS AVAILABLE FOR  
NATO AT SIMPLE ALERT, IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE NATO ALERT SYSTEM?  
IF NOT, MAY THE REASONS BE STATED?

1L09

PROBLEM:

PART (C) OF THIS FORCE GOAL CALLED FOR THE RESEARCH AND  
DEVELOPMENT OF A WARNING CAPABILITY AGAINST ACTIVE LASER SYSTEMS  
TO BE DISTRIBUTED ON A SCALE OF ONE SET OF EQUIPMENT PER SECTION  
EQUIVALENT AND IN THE CASE OF ARMoured UNITS ONE PER ARMoured  
VEHICLE. THIS ASPECT OF THE PROPOSAL WAS NOT SPECIFICALLY  
MENTIONED IN THE DPQ REPLY.

QUESTION:

IS A SECTION LEVEL WARNING CAPABILITY AGAINST ACTIVE LASER  
SYSTEMS PART OF THE CURRENT RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMME?

1L10

PROBLEM:

PARTS (A) AND (B) OF THIS FORCE GOAL CALLED FOR THE PRODUCTION  
AND PROCUREMENT FOR ARMY AIRCRAFT AND HELICOPTERS OF A RADAR  
WARNING CAPABILITY AND A SELF-PROTECTIVE RADAR COUNTERMEASURE  
CAPABILITY. THESE POINTS WERE NOT ADDRESSED IN THE DPQ REPLY.

SECRET

PAGE 03 NATO 05483 050933Z

QUESTION:

IS IT INTENDED TO PRODUCE AND PROCURE FOR ARMY AIRCRAFT AND  
HELICOPTERS:

(A) A RADAR WARNING CAPABILITY?

(B) A SELF-PROTECTIVE RADAR COUNTERMEASURES CAPABILITY?

1L24

QUESTION:

HAS THE UNITED STATES RECEIVED A FIRM REQUEST FOR ASSISTANCE  
IN THE TRAINING OF NATIONAL ADM TEAMS FOR ANY NATION?

1L25

PROBLEM:

IN THE CONTEXT OF THE CURRENT STUDIES SEEKING FLEXIBILITY IN THE EMPLOYMENT OF CENTRAL REGION FORCES DEPLOYMENT OF THE ACCB TO EUROPE AND ITS ASSIGNMENT TO NATO WOULD BE A CONSIDERABLE ADVANCE IN THE FORCE LEVEL POSTURE OF ACE.

QUESTION:

IS THE UNITED STATES PREPARED TO GIVE FURTHER CONSIDERATION TO THE PROPOSALS TO STATION THE ACCB IN EUROPE?

1L27

PROBLEM:

THE FORCE GOAL CALLING FOR ONE BATTERY OF SAM-LO (MEDIUM RANGE) AT EACH OF FIVE AIR BASES AND ONE DEPOT COMPLEX IN 4ATAF REAR AREA IS REJECTED BY THE UNITED STATES.

QUESTION:

WHAT ALTERNATIVE MEANS CAN BE FOUND TO PROVIDE AN EFFECTIVE SAM-LO DEFENCE TO THESE BASES?

1L28

PROBLEM:

THE US PROPOSED SHORAD SYSTEM FOR THE DEFENCE OF FIELD ARMY ASSETS AND SURFACE TO AIR (SAM) MISSILE BATTERIES WILL NOT BE DEPLOYED TO EUROPE WITHIN THE 1975-1980 FORCE GOAL TIME FRAME.

QUESTION:

IS CONSIDERATION BEING GIVEN TO PROCUREMENT OF SYSTEMS CURRENTLY BEING BROUGHT INTO USE BY OTHER NATIONS?

SECRET

PAGE 04 NATO 05483 050933Z

1L32

PROBLEM:

THE UNITED STATES HAD REJECTED THIS FORCE GOAL WHICH CALLS FOR COMBAT FORCES LOCATED IN CONTINENTAL EUROPE, INCLUDING ADM TEAMS TO BE ASSIGNED TO SACEUR AT SIMPLE ALERT.

QUESTION:

IS THE UNITED STATES IN A POSITION TO GIVE REASONS FOR THE REJECTION OF THIS PROPOSAL?

AIR FORCE QUESTIONS

1. (NS) RE: RECONNAISSANCE FORCES, MEMORANDUM, PAGE 47: DPQ 74 RESPONSE INDICATES THAT THE RECONNAISSANCE FORCES MAY BE CHANGED IN AVAILABILITY STATUS AND THERE MAY BE COMPENSATION OF ADDITIONAL ATTACK SQUADRONS.

QUESTIONS:

- A. REDUCTIONS IN AVAILABILITY OF EARMARKED FORCES WITHOUT POSITIVE COMPENSATION WOULD BE VIEWED AS A UNILATERAL REDUCTION. HAS THIS BEEN CONSIDERED BY US AUTHORITIES?
- B. DO US AUTHORITIES CONSIDER THAT EXCESS RECCE CAPABILITY

EXISTS WITH IN-PLACE FORCES?

C. WOULD THE TACTICAL FIGHTERS THREATRE BASED OR TEMPORATILY  
DEPLOYED HAVE ANY RECCE CAPABILITY?

2. (NS) RE: ANNEX 2 OF TABLE 1, SERIAL NO. 123

THIS TABLE REFLECTS 1 SQUADRON OF F-15 IN THE RAPID  
REACTION FORCES IN THE FBA ROLE WHILE TABLE 1 RFLECTS  
ALL 4 SQUADRONS OF F-15 IN THE AWX TOLE. WHICH TABLE IS  
CORRECT?

3. (NS) RE: TABLE 1, RAPID REACTION FORCES

RESPONSE INDICATES A PLANNED REDUCTION OF 2 SQUADRONS OF  
CAPABILITY IN THE FBS/A ROLE AND ADDING 1 EACH IN THE  
FBA AND AWX ROLE, END 78.

QUESTIONS:

A. WHAT IS THE RATIONALE FOR THIS CHANGE?  
SECRET

PAGE 05 NATO 05483 050933Z

B. IS THIS PLANNED REDUCTION ASSOCIATED WITH THE RECENTLY  
ANNOUNCED STUDY ON POSSIBLE REDUCTION OF NUCLEAR WEAPONS  
IN EUROPE?

4. (NS) NATIONAL RESPONSES TO FORCE GOALS ARE VERY  
IMPORTANT IN EVALUATING THE NEED FOR MODIFICATION/DELETION  
OF FORCE GOALS IN THE NEXT CYCLE. IN THIS REGARD, NO  
INFORMATION IS PROVIDED CONVERNING SEVERAL FORCE GOALS.  
COULD THE US AUTHORITIES PROVIDE ADDITIONAL INFORMATION  
ON THOSE FORCE GOALS NOT ADDRESSED FOR THE AIR FORCE?

END TEXT.

MCAULIFFE.

SECRET

<< END OF DOCUMENT >>

## Message Attributes

**Automatic Decaptioning:** X  
**Capture Date:** 11 JUN 1999  
**Channel Indicators:** n/a  
**Current Classification:** UNCLASSIFIED  
**Concepts:** n/a  
**Control Number:** n/a  
**Copy:** SINGLE  
**Draft Date:** 04 OCT 1974  
**Decaption Date:** 01 JAN 1960  
**Decaption Note:**  
**Disposition Action:** RELEASED  
**Disposition Approved on Date:**  
**Disposition Authority:** garlanwa  
**Disposition Case Number:** n/a  
**Disposition Comment:** 25 YEAR REVIEW  
**Disposition Date:** 28 MAY 2004  
**Disposition Event:**  
**Disposition History:** n/a  
**Disposition Reason:**  
**Disposition Remarks:**  
**Document Number:** 1974ATO05483  
**Document Source:** ADS  
**Document Unique ID:** 00  
**Drafter:** n/a  
**Enclosure:** n/a  
**Executive Order:** 11652 GDS  
**Errors:** n/a  
**Film Number:** n/a  
**From:** NATO  
**Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Image Path:**  
**ISecure:** 1  
**Legacy Key:** link1974/newtext/t19741091/abbryxpf.tel  
**Line Count:** 198  
**Locator:** TEXT ON-LINE  
**Office:** n/a  
**Original Classification:** SECRET  
**Original Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Original Previous Classification:** n/a  
**Original Previous Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Page Count:** 4  
**Previous Channel Indicators:**  
**Previous Classification:** SECRET  
**Previous Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Reference:** n/a  
**Review Action:** RELEASED, APPROVED  
**Review Authority:** garlanwa  
**Review Comment:** n/a  
**Review Content Flags:**  
**Review Date:** 11 APR 2002  
**Review Event:**  
**Review Exemptions:** n/a  
**Review History:** RELEASED <11 APR 2002 by boyleja>; APPROVED <15-Oct-2002 by garlanwa>  
**Review Markings:**

Declassified/Released  
US Department of State  
EO Systematic Review  
30 JUN 2005

**Review Media Identifier:**  
**Review Referrals:** n/a  
**Review Release Date:** n/a  
**Review Release Event:** n/a  
**Review Transfer Date:**  
**Review Withdrawn Fields:** n/a  
**Secure:** OPEN  
**Status:** NATIVE  
**Subject:** US TRILATERAL DPQ EXAMINATION  
**TAGS:** MPOL, PFOR, NATO, US  
**To:** STATE  
SECDEF INFO USNMR SHAPE  
USCINCEUR  
USLOSACLANT  
CINCLANT  
**Type:** TE  
**Markings:** Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 30 JUN 2005

